

PANLIANT FINANCIAL)	
CORPORATION <i>et al</i> ,)	Case No.: 2:12-cv-01376-RFB-CWH
)	
Plaintiffs,)	ORDER ACCEPTING REPORT &
vs.)	RECOMMENDATION OF MAGISTRATE
)	JUDGE CARL W. HOFFMAN
ISEE3D, INC. <i>et al</i> ,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

A district court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). A party may file specific written objections to the findings and recommendations of a magistrate judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Local Rule IB 3-2(a). When written objections have been filed, the district court is required to “make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *see also* Local Rule IB 3-2(b). Where a party fails to object, however, a district court is not required to conduct “any review,” *de novo* or otherwise, of the report and recommendations of a magistrate judge. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985).

1 Pursuant to Local Rule IB 3-2(a), objections were due by August 14, 2015. No objections
2 have been filed. The Court has reviewed the record in this case and concurs with the Magistrate
3 Judge's recommendation(s).

4 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 124) is
5 **ACCEPTED and ADOPTED in full.**

6 **IT IS ORDERED** that (ECF No. 117) Plaintiffs' Motion for Sanctions is **granted in part**
7 **and denied in part.** A default shall be entered against Romanica.

8 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that (ECF. No 114) Plaintiffs' Motion for Attorney's Fees
9 is **denied.**

10
11 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Clerk of Court shall serve this Order on the persons
12 and respective addresses noted in the Report and Recommendation.

13 DATED this 4th day of September, 2015.

14
15
16 

17 RICHARD F. BOULWARE, II
18 United States District Court
19
20
21
22
23
24
25